UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Addr ss: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/435,249	11/05/99	SCHNEIDER J	SCH01.NP001

HM12/0330

CLIFFORD KENT WEBER ESQ
THOMAS JEFFERSON UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY COUNSEL
1020 WALNUT STREET SUITE 620
PHILADELPHIA PA 19107-5587

EXAMINER	
SCHMIDT, M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1635	2

DATE MAILED: 03/30/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/435,249	Schneider
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
Schmidt	1635

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

P riod for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disp sition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☒ Other Notice To Comply w/ Sequence Rules

Office Action Summary

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for administration of specific antisense oligonucleotides for therapeutic purposes claimed, does not reasonably provide enablement for administration of any such antisense or triplex therapeutic molecule for the functions claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims are broadly drawn to: (1) methods of treating Parkinson's disease via administration of a therapeutically effective amount of antisense or triplex oligonucleotide to the substantia nigra pars reticulata or the internal globus pallidus for the downregulation of glutamic acid decarboxylase, such as GAD_{65} and/or GAD_{67} (claims 1-16), or for the downregulation of

glutamate receptors (claims 17-20), or (2) methods of treating Parkinson's disease via administration of a therapeutically effective amount of antisense or triplex oligonucleotide to the thalamic motor nuclei for the downregulation of GABA receptors (claims 21-22).

The specification as filed teaches specific antisense to rat, human and monkey GAD_{67} and GAD_{65} (SEQ ID NOS 1-6).

There is a high level of unpredictability known in the antisense art for therapeutic, *in vivo* (whole organism) applications. The factors considered barriers to successful delivery of antisense delivery to the organism are: (1) penetration of the plasma membrane of the target cells to reach the target site in the cytoplasm or nucleus, (2) withstanding enzymatic degradation, and (3) the ability to find and bind the target site and simultaneously avoid non-specific binding (see Branch). Despite the synthesis of more resilient, nuclease resistant, oligonucleotide backbones and isolated successes with antisense therapy *in vivo*, the majority of designed antisense molecules still face the challenge of successful entry and localization to the intended target and further such that antisense and other effects can routinely be obtained.

The specification as filed teaches success with administration of SEQ ID Nos 1-6. However, such application would not be expected to correlate with administration of any such oligonucleotide to the target genes *in vivo* as broadly claimed. Note Branch who teaches the state of the art for designing an antisense which inhibits a target *in vivo:* it "is very difficult to predict what portions of an RNA molecule will be accessible *in vivo*, effective antisense molecules must

be found empirically by screening a large number of candidates for their ability to act inside cells (Branch, p.49)."

One of skill in the art would not accept on its face the successful delivery of any antisense molecule *in vivo* and further, treatment effects, in view of the lack of guidance in the specification and the unpredictability in the art. Neither the specification nor technology today teach general guidelines for successful delivery or treatment effects of antisense molecules in whole organisms. Specifically the specification does not teach (1) stability of the antisense molecule *in vivo*, (2)effective delivery to the whole organism and specificity to the target tissues, (3) dosage and toxicity, nor (4) entry of molecule into cell and effective action therein marked by visualization of the desired treatment effects for the scope of possible target regions. These key factors are those found to be highly unpredictable in the art as discussed *supra*. The lack of guidance in the specification as filed for these factors would therefore require "trial and error" experimentation beyond which is taught by the specification as filed. Therefore, it would require undue experimentation to practice the invention as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Mary M. Schmidt*, whose telephone number is (703) 308-4471.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *George Elliott, Ph.D.* may be reached at (703) 308-4003.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

George C. Elliott, Ph.D.
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

M. M. Schmidt
March 27, 2000